

TO: UTC

FROM: Deborah Anderson, Ken Whistler, Rick McGowan, Roozbeh Pournader, and Laurentiu Iancu

SUBJECT: Recommendations to UTC #138 February 2014 on Script Proposals

DATE: 26 January 2014

The recommendations below are based on documents available to the members of this group at the time they met, and do not include documents submitted later to the document registry.

SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA

Telugu and Kannada

1. [L2/14-005](#) On the Telugu and Kannada Vowel Signs for O and OO – Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which discusses two ways to mark dependent vowels O and OO in Telugu and Kannada, and suggests the document be used as a UTN on the topic.

We do not recommend this document be made into a UTN at this time, because two characters discussed in the document, the single-part O and OO Kannada, are proposed in L2/14-004 and have not yet been approved. Once the proposed vowel signs Kannada O and OO have been dealt with, the document might be ready for a UTN, pending any necessary modifications (based on the UTC's response to L2/14-004).

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss the document.

Kannada

2. [L2/13-242](#) Representation of Jihvamuliya and Upadhmaniya in Kannada – Srinidhi

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which details the conjunct stacking behavior of Kannada Jihvamuliya and Upadhmaniya, not yet noted in the Kannada block introduction, but very useful for font creators. Ultimately, such information has implications for the provisional properties Indic_Matra_Category and Indic_Syllabic_Category.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review this document, and remand it to the Editorial Committee for inclusion in the Kannada block introduction. Also, if attestation of use of the data contained in Indic_Matra_Category and the Indic_Syllabic_Category properties is provided by members, the UTC may wish to make a decision as to status of these categories, i.e., whether they should be made informative, and, if so, add Kannada Jihvamuliya and Upadhmaniya to the data files, as appropriate.

3. [L2/13-232](#) Request to change the Unicode chart font for Kannada – Srinidhi

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which requested a change of the Kannada chart font to the Lohit font. We noted that the Tamil chart font will be changed to the Lohit font in 7.0.

Recommendation: We recommend the editor take a look at the font and consider its adoption as the chart font.

4. [L2/13-228](#) The Kannada "nakaara-pollu" Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which provides details on an alternate form of the vowelless NA in Kannada, comparable to the nakaara-pollu in Telugu.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC take no action, but remand this document to the Editorial Committee, as potential documentation for the Kannada block introduction.

5. [L2/14-004](#) Proposal to encode archaic vowel signs O OO for Kannada – Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which proposes two new characters, KANNADA VOWEL SIGN ARCHAIC O and KANNADA VOWEL SIGN ARCHAIC OO. We believe encoding two vowel sign O's would be duplicate encoded, since they are semantically identical to the already encoded O's (no examples of contrast were provided), and would be collated the same. Because duplicate encoding will introduce problems in the representation of text, we feel encoding these two characters is probably not recommended (though we are aware of other examples of duplicate encoding). It is not clear that the distinction in the glyphs could not be done in an OpenType font.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss this proposal.

Grantha

6. [L2/14-002](#) Finalizing the Grantha virama model – Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which lays out the Grantha virama model, a model similar to that found in Telugu, Kannada, and Bhaiksuki.

The Grantha virama model picks up on the GOI's recommendation in the 2010 meeting report on the Grantha script, L2/10-409, which stated that because all the vowelless consonant forms in Grantha were semantically equivalent, they should be handled at the font level, and not the encoding level. The committee recommended not encoding a ligating virama.

Recommendation: The UTC should review this document, alongside [L2/14-020](#) Plain-text Ligating Virama Representation for Grantha script (a recent submission, not reviewed by this group). After discussion, the UTC may decide to forward the document to the Editorial Committee for inclusion in the Grantha block introduction.

Malayalam

7. [L2/14-003](#) Proposal to encode 0D00 MALAYALAM SIGN COMBINING ANUSVARA ABOVE – Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which proposes a character similar to the GRANTHA SIGN COMBINING ANUSVARA ABOVE (L2/13-061). (Note: A feedback document on the document was received after the script group met, so a full review of all the relevant documents could not be conducted.)

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss this proposal alongside [L2/14-029](#) Feedback on Malayalam Anusvara Above Proposal.

9. [L2/14-015](#) Proposal to encode MALAYALAM SIGN VERTICAL BAR VIRAMA – Cibu

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, but were not convinced that a strong enough case has been made to encode more virama marks in Malayalam, even if they appear in the historical period.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review this document.

10. [L2/14-014](#) Proposal to encode MALAYALAM SIGN CIRCULAR VIRAMA – Cibu, Siju, Sunil

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. As with VERTICAL BAR VIRAMA, we are unsure whether encoding more viramas are necessary for Malayalam, even for historical material. We did note examples showing contrastive use of the CANDRAKKALA and the circular virama on page 3, 4, and 5.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss this proposal.

11. [L2/14-017](#) Proposal to encode MALAYALAM LETTER CHILLU Y – Cibu

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal for a CHILLU Y, which provided attestations of its use. The proposed relocation of CHILLU LLL from U+0C34 (its current location in PDAM1) to U+0D56 and placement of CHILLU Y in U+0D55 seems reasonable, in order to keep the chillus together.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC accept MALAYALAM LETTER CHILLU Y at U+0D55, moving CHILLU LLL to U+0D56 as proposed.

12. [L2/14-013](#) Proposal to encode MALAYALAM LETTER CHILLU M – Cibu

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which provides evidence for the CHILLU M. The request to move CHILLU LLL so it will be beside CHILLU Y and CHILLU M is reasonable, and the placement of CHILLU M at U+0D54 is fine.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC accept MALAYALAM LETTER CHILLU M at U+0D54 (with proposed move for CHILLU LLL, as noted in #11).

13. [L2/14-016](#) Proposal to encode MALAYALAM MEASUREMENT SYMBOL PARA – Cibu

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which is requesting a MALAYALAM SIGN PARA, a symbol used to designate a unit of measurement. As noted on the bottom of page 1, the character looks like a ligature of NNNA and RA. How is this different from the Tamil fractions proposal, where units handled by ligatures were not encoded? Should this instead be handled as a sequence of characters? Also, on page 2, the example from page 118 shows the symbol with a small circle above; is this a variant?

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss this proposal.

14. *Tamil*

[L2/14-018](#) Spelling changes for Tamil fractions and symbols – Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, and noted that this follows up on an action item for Mani Manivannan, Shriramana Sharma, Naga Ganesan ([137-A50](#)) to work out a consistent approach to Tamil fraction names.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC take no action, pending feedback from INFITT and other interested communities.

15. *Tangsa*

[L2/13-230](#) **Introducing Latsam Khimhun's Script for Tangsa (WG2 N4497) – SEI/Pandey**

Discussion: We reviewed this introductory proposal, which is for a relatively new script.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC members review this proposal and send comments to the author.

16. [L2/13-231](#) **Introducing Lakhum Mossang's Script for Tangsa (WG2 N4496) – SEI/Pandey**

Discussion: We reviewed this introductory proposal, which is for a relatively new script.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC members review this proposal and send comments to the author.

17. *Rañjana*

[L2/13-243](#) **Proposal to Encode Ranjana Script – Dev Dass Manandhar, et al**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal for the Ranjana script. The proposal was unclear on the model and confuses two issues: how glyphs are built up and how to represent text by a sequence of characters. The two proposed new joiners, Ranjana Non-Space-Joiner and a Ranjana-Space-Joiner, do not fit with the current model of Brahmi-derived scripts. The proposed character at XX4C, HAKSSAMALAWARAYA, contains an image; a proposal would need a glyph.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC not accept this proposal, but send the author feedback.

18. *Bhaiksuki*

[L2/14-036](#) **Revised Proposal to Encode the Bhaiksuki Script in ISO/IEC 10646 – Pandey**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal that has been seen several times before by the UTC. We noted that the digit and numeric properties should be reviewed carefully, and may need correction (i.e., BHAIKSUKI DIGIT ONE, etc., should not have gc=Nd). The revised proposal discusses two-part vowels in §3.5.2, a topic raised at the last UTC. With a careful review (and correction of any noted errors), we believe this proposal should be ready for approval.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review this proposal and make a decision.

19. *Zanabazar script*

[L2/14-024](#) **Proposal to Encode the Zanabazar Square Script –Pandey**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which has undergone a number of changes since the last version. The script was approved at the last UTC under the name “Mongolian Square Script.”

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review this proposal, which had earlier been approved under the name “Mongolian Square”, and decide how to proceed.

SOUTH AND EAST ASIAN

20. *Siddham*

[L2/13-233](#) **2013-11-22 Siddham Script (梵字) Meeting @ Tokyo, JAPAN, Earth – Lunde**

Discussion: We reviewed this meeting report, which recorded the results of a meeting in Tokyo on Siddham in November. The discussion at the last UTC reflected misgivings on Siddham variants, and the US ballot comments recommended the variants be pulled from the PDAM because they were deemed not yet mature.

Recommendation: This document is a FYI to the UTC, with a reminder that Siddham will be discussed at WG2.

PHILIPPINES

21. *Eskaya*

[L2/13-229](#) **Additional Information on the Eskaya Script of the Philippines (WG2 N4499) - Pandey**

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which provides additional information on the Eskaya script, which was mentioned in the UTN #35 Indonesian and Philippine Scripts and extensions.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC take note of this document and send comments to the author.

EAST ASIA

22. *Tangut*

[L2/13-241](#) **Summary of Tangut meeting (Beijing, China) — Anderson**

Discussion: We reviewed this document.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss this document along with other Tangut-related documents in the document registry.

SYMBOLS

23. [L2/13-227](#) **Proposal for the Addition of Indian Classical Music symbols Hardeep –Singh Jawanda, et al.**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. Before any decision by the UTC be made, we suggest the author address the following in their proposal:

- Propose the implementation framework: is this plain text or is it to be handled by higher-level protocol, with the pieces individually encoded (as is done for Western music symbols)?

- Review other proposals that have been received by the Unicode Consortium, such as for Bengali (Akarmatric music notation [L2/13-157](#)), Karnatic, etc. (see <http://www.unicode.org/mail-arch/unicode-ml/Archives-Old/UML025/0430.html>).
- Discuss the Indian Classical music notation as a whole, not script-by-script.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss the proposal and send the author feedback.

24. [L2/13-235](#) **Proposal to encode the RUBLE SIGN (WG2 N4512) – Everson**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC approve this character, after discussing the proposal and deciding on the glyph shape.

25. [L2/14-009](#) **Proposal to include IEC Power Button Symbols – Eden, Loughry and Nordman**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which appeared to be well-formed, though there appear to be opportunities for unification, particularly for the POWER ON, POWER OFF, and SLEEP symbols.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss these symbols

PUNCTUATION

26. [L2/13-237](#) **Precomposed punctuation proposal –Larionov**

Discussion: We have reviewed this proposal and we recommend the UTC not approve it.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC go on record as not wanting this request to progress.

27. [L2/13-238](#) **Proposal to Encode a Slavonic Punctuation Mark in Unicode – Andreev, et al**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. This revision addresses comments made at the last UTC concerning the name (formerly “Slavonic Spear” and “Slavonic Paragraphos”), why a currently encoded dash or bar could not work, and the role of the dots in some of the examples.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC accept the DASH WITH LEFT UPTURN, after discussion.